

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

FC 2011-007061

04/30/2012

HON. PAMELA GATES

CLERK OF THE COURT

V. Stevens

Deputy

IN RE THE MATTER OF
KLARISSA ARD

KLARISSA ARD
5602 CHICKEN SHACK RD
OCONTO WI 54153

AND

STEVE MRAOVIC

MICHAEL S BAKER

CONCILIATION SERVICES-CCC
DOCKET-FAMILY COURT CCC
FAMILY COURT SERVICES-CCC

PATERNITY JUDGMENT

Trial was held on April 17, 2012 regarding Petitioner's Petition to Establish Paternity, Child Custody, Parenting Time and Child Support. Petitioner Klarissa Ard is hereinafter referred to as "Mother." Respondent Steve Mraovic is hereinafter referred to as "Father." Both Mother and Father were sworn and offered evidence and testimony.

Based upon the testimony and evidence presented, the Court makes the following findings and orders:

I. JURISDICTION.

THE COURT FINDS that this Court has jurisdiction over the parties and issues presented as authorized by law and that the minor children who are the subject of this action lived in Arizona with a parent, or a person acting as a parent, for at least six consecutive months or more prior to the commencement of this action, or at least from the time of birth of the

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

FC 2011-007061

04/30/2012

children until this action was commenced, such that Arizona is the home state of the children pursuant to A.R.S. § 25-1031(A)(1).

II. PARENT EDUCATION PROGRAM.

THE COURT FINDS that the domestic relations education provisions of A.R.S. § 25-352 have been satisfied.

III. PATERNITY.

Paternity was previously established.

VI. CUSTODY, DOMESTIC VIOLENCE, AND PARENTING TIME.

The best interest of the children is the primary consideration in awarding child custody. *See Hays v. Gama*, 205 Ariz. 99, 102, 67 P.3d 695, 698 (2003). Arizona Revised Statutes § 25-403(A) enumerates specific factors for the Court to consider, among other relevant factors, in making a determination concerning the children's best interests. *See* A.R.S. § 25-403(A) ("The Court shall determine custody, either originally or on petition for modification, in accordance with the best interests of the child. The Court shall consider all relevant factors including [the eleven factors enumerated in the subsection].").

In making a custody determination, the Court is mindful that as a matter of public policy, absent evidence to the contrary, "it is in a child's best interest: (1) To have substantial, frequent, meaningful and continuing parenting time with both parents; [and] (2) To have both parents participate in decision-making about the child." *See* A.R.S. § 25-103(B). The Court has also considered the statutory requirements of A.R.S. § 25-403.03. Arizona Revised Statutes § 25-403.03(B) states:

The court shall consider evidence of domestic violence as being contrary to the best interests of the child. The court shall consider the safety and well-being of the child and of the victim of the act of domestic violence to be of primary importance. The court shall consider a perpetrator's history of causing or threatening to cause physical harm to another person.

Mother alleged that Father committed acts of domestic violence throughout their relationship. In accordance with A.R.S. § 25-403.03(C), the Court has considered the following factors and makes the following findings to determine whether domestic violence has been committed:

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

FC 2011-007061

04/30/2012

1. *Findings From Another Court Of Competent Jurisdiction.* Mother has not obtained an Order of Protection against Father.
2. *Police Reports.* Mother alleged domestic violence; however, Mother never contacted the police.
3. *Medical Reports.* Mother offered no medical reports of physical violence.
4. *Child Protective Services Records.* The Court reviewed no CPS records relevant to this case.
5. *Domestic Violence Shelter Records.* The Court found no relevant domestic violence shelter records.
6. *School Records.* The Court reviewed a portion of the children's school records; however the records did not refute or support a finding of domestic violence.
7. *Witness Testimony.* The Court found Mother's testimony credible, in part. The Court finds that during the parties' relationship, Father engaged in conduct that caused Mother to feel controlled and to fear for her safety. The Court finds that Mother is currently desirous of maintaining a relationship with Father and has emotionally exaggerated responses when interacting with him. Mother's testimony suggests that she continues to struggle with a desire to obtain Father's approval, while wishing to gain independence from him. The Court finds that Father historically controlled Mother's behavior, in part, by denying her access to money and withholding affirmation and attention. The Court finds suspect Mother's testimony that she fled Arizona as a result of Father's violence. Rather, the Court finds that in approximately May 2011, Mother learned that Father was romantically involved with another individual, and Mother expressed a desire to leave the relationship and establish independence. At the time, Mother indicated a desire to remain in Phoenix. However, the Court questions whether Mother genuinely intended to leave the relationship in May 2011. Mother did not explore any meaningful means of obtaining financial independence. Mother eventually decided to leave the relationship in October 2011. However, rather than leave the relationship and obtain employment in Arizona, Mother returned to Wisconsin to live with her family for emotional and financial support. Mother unexpectedly removed the children from school and relocated the children to Wisconsin without Father's knowledge or permission. The children's maternal grandmother provided Mother with \$5,000.00 to fly the children and Mother to Wisconsin; however, of note, Mother could have equally used the financial resources to obtain a stable apartment in Arizona while looking for suitable employment. While establishing financial independence, Mother could have sought the assistance of programs

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

FC 2011-007061

04/30/2012

for victims of domestic violence. Mother is currently working two jobs in Wisconsin, and the Court finds that Mother is capable of obtaining comparable employment in Arizona. Based on the credible testimony of the parties,

THE COURT FINDS that Father has engaged in acts of domestic violence against Mother. Specifically, the Court finds that Father engaged in a pattern of behavior for which a Court could have issued an *ex parte* order to protect Mother.

Having found the existence of domestic violence, the Court also considered A.R.S. § 25-403.03(A), which states that notwithstanding the presumption in subsection D, “joint custody shall not be awarded if the Court makes a finding of the existence of significant domestic violence pursuant to § 13-3601 or if the court finds by a preponderance of the evidence that there has been significant domestic violence.” A.R.S. § 25-403.03(A) (emphasis added); *see also Hurd v. Hurd*, 223 Ariz. 48, 51, 219 P.3d 258, 261 (Ct. App. 2009)(“when the party that committed the act of violence has not rebutted the presumption that awarding custody to that person is contrary to the best interest of the child, the court need not consider all the other best-interest factors in A.R.S. § 25-403.A.”).

It is noted that any domestic violence is serious and cause for concern, particularly when directed at another parent and in the presence of the minor children. The Court finds that Father’s controlling behavior and demeaning conduct was contrary to the best interests of the minor children. The Court by no means condones Father’s actions; however, Father’s actions, in the spectrum of domestic violence, do not constitute significant domestic violence as contemplated by the statute.

Arizona Revised Statutes § 403.03(D) states, if the Court determines that a parent who is seeking custody has committed an act of domestic violence *against the other parent*, there is a rebuttable presumption that an award of custody to the parent who committed the act of domestic violence is contrary to the children’s best interests. *See* A.R.S. 403.03(D) (Emphasis added).

Father has requested sole legal custody of the minor children. To determine whether Father has rebutted the presumption that an award of sole legal custody or joint legal custody is contrary to the children’s best interests, the Court considered the following:

1. *Whether the parent has demonstrated that being awarded sole custody or joint physical or legal custody is in the children's best interests.* The Court finds that Father has not demonstrated that being awarded sole custody is in the children’s best interests. However, the Court finds that Father has demonstrated that being awarded joint legal custody is in the children’s best interests.

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

FC 2011-007061

04/30/2012

2. *Whether the parent has successfully completed a batterer's prevention program.* Father has not completed a batterer's prevention program; however, in connection with this order, Father is obligated to complete a program. Father's failure to complete the program may result in the Court modifying its orders regarding custody and parenting time.
3. *Whether the parent has successfully completed a program of alcohol or drug abuse counseling, if the Court determines that counseling is appropriate.* Father has not been Court-ordered to complete a program of alcohol or drug abuse counseling. The Court finds no concern regarding Father's alcohol or drug use.
4. *Whether the parent has successfully completed a parenting class, if the Court determines that a parenting class is appropriate.* The Court has not ordered Father to complete any additional parenting classes.
5. *If the parent is on probation, parole or community supervision, whether the parent is restrained by a protective order that was granted after a hearing.* Mother did not obtain a protective order against Father.
6. *Whether the parent has committed any further acts of domestic violence.* Father has not committed further acts of domestic violence against Mother. However, notably, Mother remains disproportionately emotional regarding Father's lack of affirmation. The Court finds that Father was aware that Mother felt controlled by Father. Of note, Father's conduct may not have elicited a similar reaction from a different individual; however, the Court finds that Mother is particularly vulnerable and reactive to Father's emotional control of her.

Based on a review of all the evidence and testimony, the Court finds that Father has rebutted the presumption against joint legal custody. Therefore, the Court orders that the parties shall have joint legal custody of the minor children. In entering this order, the Court also considered the factors of A.R.S. §§ 25-403 and 403.01. Specifically, the Court finds the following:

1. The wishes of the children's parent or parents as to custody. Father seeks sole legal custody. Mother requests joint legal custody of the children.
2. The wishes of the children as to the custodian. The oldest child, Alexa, was interviewed in connection with the Parenting Conference. The child reported a healthy bond with both Mother and Father. The child reported that Father yelled loud.

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

FC 2011-007061

04/30/2012

3. The interaction and interrelationship of the children with the children's parent or parents, the children's siblings and any other person who may significantly affect the children's best interest. Mother and Father were involved in a relationship for 17 years. The children have a healthy and bonded relationship with Mother and Father. The paternal grandparents live in the guest house at the home where Father and the minor children are living. Mother is currently living with her parents and niece. Mother's brother, Romulus, has issues with mental health and the testimony suggested concern regarding his stability. Based on the testimony, the Court questions whether Mother has the emotional strength to protect the minor children from Romulus if he created a dangerous situation. Therefore, the Court is ordering no physical contact between Romulus and the minor children absent agreement between the parties or Court order.
4. The children's adjustment to home, school and community. The testimony indicated that the minor children are well-adjusted to their current living environment. The children would benefit from increased parenting time with Mother; however, Mother has elected to move to Wisconsin. If Mother resided in Arizona, the Court finds the children would benefit from an equal parenting time schedule.
5. The mental and physical health of all individuals involved. The Court finds that Mother would benefit from classes for victims of domestic violence and continued therapy with her psychiatrist. The Court finds that Father would benefit from batterer's prevention courses. Ashley is autistic. Ashley also suffers from chronic vomiting. Alexa has ADHD. Father testified that the children are stable in their education.
6. Which parent is more likely to allow the children frequent and meaningful continuing contact with the other parent. This paragraph does not apply if the Court determines that a parent is acting in good faith to protect the children from witnessing an act of domestic violence or being a victim of domestic violence or child abuse. The Court finds that Mother is more willing to allow the children frequent and meaningful continuing contact with Father. The Court has concern that Father will attempt to control Mother by denying her access to the children. The Court advises Father that violation of the Court's orders, which result in Mother not having Court-ordered telephonic contact or parenting time with the minor children may result in the Court modifying the Court ordered custody and parenting time schedule. Moreover, violation of the Court ordered parenting time may subject Father to sanctions, including penalties, fines, and incarceration. Furthermore, Father should recognize that parenting time between Mother and the

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

FC 2011-007061

04/30/2012

minor children is in the children's best interest. Mother is advised that she may seek Court involvement to enforce the Court's orders regarding custody and parenting time.

7. Whether one parent, both parents or neither parent has provided primary care of the children. Both parents provided care of the minor children. Father has recently provide exclusive care of the children.
8. The nature and extent of coercion or duress used by a parent in obtaining an agreement regarding custody. There is no agreement regarding custody.
9. Whether a parent has complied with Chapter 3, Article 5 of Title 25 (Parent Information Program). Father has not complied with this requirement
10. Whether either parent was convicted of an act of false reporting of child abuse or neglect under A.R.S. § 13-2907.02. Neither party has been convicted of an act of false reporting of child abuse or neglect under A.R.S. § 13-2907.02.
11. Whether there has been domestic violence or child abuse as defined in A.R.S. § 25-403.03. The Court finds that Father has perpetrated an act of domestic violence against Mother.
12. The agreement of lack of an agreement by the parents regarding the joint custody. There is no agreement between the parents regarding joint custody.
13. Whether a parent's lack of agreement is unreasonable or is influenced by an issue not related to the best interests of the child. The Court finds that the parties' unwillingness to agree to joint custody is not related to the children's best interest. The Court concludes that the parties are capable of working together maturely to reach joint decisions regarding the best interests of the children. Father testified that he struggles to reach Mother; however, the Court finds that Father is capable of communicating with Mother to discuss, via email or telephone, major decisions related to the children.
14. The past, present and future abilities of the parents to cooperate in decision making about the children to the extent required by the order of joint custody. The Court finds that the children would benefit from the active involvement of both parents in making major decisions.

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

FC 2011-007061

04/30/2012

15. Whether the joint custody arrangement is logistically possible. The Court concludes that a joint custody arrangement is logistically possible. Father asserted that Mother rarely has telephone access. The Court finds that the parents can communicate by email regarding major decisions.

Next, the Court turns to the issue of parenting time. Arizona Revised Statutes § 25-403.03(B) (Supp. 2009) requires the Court to “consider the safety and well-being of the child and the victim of the act of domestic violence to be of primary importance.” As such, when determining child custody, the Court must “consider evidence of domestic violence as being contrary to the best interests of the child” and the perpetrator’s history of causing . . . physical harm to another person.” A.R.S. § 25-403.03(B).

Because the Court found that Father has committed an act of domestic violence, he has the burden of proving to the Court's satisfaction that parenting time will not endanger the children or significantly impair the children’s emotional development. Arizona Revised Statutes § 25-403.03(F) states if the parent fails to meet this burden to the Court's satisfaction, the Court shall place conditions on parenting time that best protect the children and the other parent from further harm. The Court may: 1) Order that an exchange of the children must occur in a protected setting as specified by the Court; 2) Order that an agency specified by the Court must supervise parenting time or allow a family or household member to supervise parenting time, if the Court establishes conditions that this person must follow during parenting time; 3) Order the parent who committed the act of domestic violence to attend and complete, to the Court's satisfaction, a program of intervention for perpetrators of domestic violence and any other counseling the court orders; 4) Order the parent who committed the act of domestic violence to abstain from possessing or consuming alcohol or controlled substances during parenting time and for twenty-four hours before parenting time; 5) Order the parent who committed the act of domestic violence to pay a fee to the Court to defray the costs of supervised parenting time; 6) Prohibit overnight parenting time; 7) Require a bond from the parent who committed the act of domestic violence for the children's safe return; 8) Order that the address of the children and the other parent remain confidential; or 9) Impose any other condition that the Court determines is necessary to protect the children, the other parent and any other family or household member. The Court finds that Father satisfied his burden of demonstrating that parenting time between Father and minor children will not endanger the children or significantly impair the children’s emotional development.

IT IS ORDERED:

1. The parties are awarded joint legal custody of the minor children, with neither parent having superior decision-making authority. The parties are informed that joint legal custody does not necessarily mean equal parenting time.

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

FC 2011-007061

04/30/2012

2. Each party is entitled to full and unrestricted access to all medical, dental, prescription and health related records of the children and may secure information from and consult with all health care professionals providing care of the minor children. Each party shall keep the other party informed of the names, addresses and telephone numbers of all such health care providers. A parent who attempts to restrict the release of documents or information by the custodian without a prior court order is subject to appropriate legal sanction.
3. Each party is entitled to full and unrestricted access to all school records, teacher, administrators, and other school officials involved in the children's education. Both parents shall be listed as and identified as contact persons on all records. A parent who attempts to restrict the release of documents or information by the custodian without a prior court order is subject to appropriate legal sanction.
4. In the event of any emergency or urgent circumstances involving the children, the party then having physical custody of the children shall inform the other party of the nature of the emergency or urgent circumstance as soon as is reasonably possible.
5. Each party shall have the right to attend and participate in school conferences, activities, and events, extra-curricular activities, and any other similar event in which parents are routinely invited or permitted to attend.
6. Unless restricted by Court order, each party shall keep the other informed of his/her home address, home telephone number, employer and address, work telephone number, and, if applicable, cellular telephone number and e-mail address.
7. The parties shall jointly decide major life decisions concerning their children. Major life decisions include, without limitation, the selection of healthcare providers; dental and medical needs, treatment, and plans; regular and/or special educational needs and plans; mental health needs, treatment, and plans; and, at times, religious training. In making decisions regarding major life decisions concerning the children, each party has an affirmative obligation to (1) confer in good faith with the other party, (2) give equal consideration to the other party's perspective, and (3) work cooperatively with the other party. If the parties decide to seek advice from healthcare professionals or educators, both parties shall be provided with and entitled to such advice before making their decision. If the parties cannot agree after making a good faith effort to come to an agreement regarding a particular issue, the parties shall mediate the dispute prior to initiating

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

FC 2011-007061

04/30/2012

a proceeding with the Court, except in cases where there is a genuine and imminent threat to the health, safety, or welfare of the children.

8. Neither party shall make derogatory, disparaging, or similarly negative comments about the other party in the presence of the minor children. Neither party shall discuss family law legal proceedings with the children or use the children as messengers for parenting issues.

If Mother remains in Wisconsin,

IT IS ORDERED that Father shall be designated as the primary residential parent. Mother shall be entitled to the following parenting time with the minor children:

1. Mother shall have parenting time with the children for every Spring and Fall Break. Fall Break/Spring Break are defined to begin upon the children's release from school and continue until the day before school resumes. For example, Mother's access will begin on Friday after school ends and continue until Sunday prior to a Monday return to school.
2. Mother will have parenting time for all of summer break. Summer break is defined to begin the Sunday after the children are released from school and end seven days before school resumes.
3. Mother will have parenting time for Thanksgiving in every calendar year from Wednesday after school until Sunday, the day prior to returning to school.
4. In even-numbered years, Mother will have Christmas parenting time from the day school ends until the day prior to the return to school. In odd-numbered years, Mother shall have Christmas parenting time beginning December 26th and continuing until the day before school resumes.
5. If Mother is able to visit the children in Arizona, she is permitted up to one, seven overnight period per month with the minor children. Mother shall provide at least two weeks' notice should she seek access in Arizona.
6. For the parenting time exchanges set forth above, the minor children should be transported by vehicle or fly with a chaperone to/from Wisconsin until both parents agree that the children are able to fly without a chaperone or the Court orders that the children no longer require a chaperone when flying. Mother shall pay the costs to transport the children and the chaperone at the start of her

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

FC 2011-007061

04/30/2012

parenting time, and Father shall pay the costs to transport the children at the end of Mother's parenting time. The party purchasing the ticket shall provide the other party with details of the transportation no later than 14 days prior to the travel. The information shall include flights numbers as well as the time and date for the flights.

7. Each party shall allow the other party reasonable telephone or electronic (Skype or Face Time) access with the children while the children are in his or her physical custody. Such telephone access shall presumptively occur at 7:00 p.m. Mountain Standard Time. Father shall ensure that Mother's telephone number is not blocked. Upon receipt of the call from Mother at 7:00 p.m., he shall simply answer the phone and hand the telephone to the minor children. The party having physical custody of the children at the time of the telephone contact shall not listen in, record, or otherwise interfere with the contact. The access parent should insist that the children receive the phone call, excepting unusual circumstances. If the children are not available and a message is left requesting a return call, the return call should be made within 24 hours. The children should be given privacy such that an adult does not overhear their conversation. In the event that a parent is traveling out of state with the children, telephonic contact with the non-access parent should be kept on a reasonable basis, for example, once every three days. The access parent should have responsibility for initiating the calls and establishing a means of contact during vacation travel. Both parents should ensure the children have access to a telephone to call the non-access parent in a private manner as described above. Neither parent should be required to provide the children with their own cell phone. Reasonable telephonic or electronic access is defined as no more than one call per day initiated by the non-custodial parent, absent special circumstances. The minor children shall be permitted to have unlimited telephone contact with the non-custodial parent if the child or children request(s) to telephone the parent or the child initiates the call.
8. Each party has the right and responsibility to make, during the time that party has physical custody, routine daily decisions regarding the children's care consistent with the major decisions made by the parties as joint legal custodians.
9. If either party disputes or seeks a change in either legal custody or parenting time, that party shall first attempt to resolve the dispute or change through private mediation or mediation provided by Conciliation Services. No petition to modify custody or parenting time shall be considered absent an affirmative statement by the party seeking modification that mediation has occurred and was unsuccessful,

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

FC 2011-007061

04/30/2012

except in cases where there is a genuine and imminent threat to the health, safety, or welfare of the children.

10. At least every two years from the entry of this Judgment, the parties shall review the terms of this parenting plan for the purpose of amending the plan in accordance with the needs of the children.
11. The parents are free to deviate from the parenting time schedule by mutual agreement.

If Mother moves back to Arizona, either party may request a mediation through Conciliation Services in an effort to agree upon an equal parenting time schedule.

IT IS ORDERED that Father shall complete a batterers' prevention course and file a certificate of completion. Father shall begin the course no later than June 15, 2012. Father may select from one of the following courses:

Chrysalis – 1010 E McDowell Rd, Suite 301, Phoenix, AZ 85006 Telephone 602 955-9059.

New Horizons Counseling Agency – 5062 N 19th Ave, Suite 102, Phoenix, AZ 85079 Telephone 623 939-6567.

Arizona Consulting and Counseling Services (ACCS) – 9162 W Cactus Rd, Suite B, Peoria, AZ 85381, Telephone 623 776-7766.

V. CHILD SUPPORT.

For the purpose of the calculating child support,

THE COURT FINDS,

Mother's Income	\$1,950.00 per month
Father's Income	\$1,950.00 per month
Parenting Time Adjustment	106 days

These findings and any other relevant financial factors required or allowed to be included by the Arizona Child Support Guidelines, are set forth in the Child Support Worksheet filed herewith and are hereby adopted by this reference. In applying these findings under the Arizona Child Support Guidelines,

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

FC 2011-007061

04/30/2012

IT IS ORDERED that Mother shall pay child support to Father in the total amount of \$364.43 per month, commencing May 1, 2012.¹ All payments shall be made through the Support Clearinghouse through an automatic Order of Assignment issued this date. Mother is advised that until such time as the Order of Assignment becomes effective, Mother has the affirmative obligation to pay the child support directly to the Support Clearinghouse. Mother shall immediately notify the Court of any change in her employment by filing a Current Employer Information sheet.

LET THE RECORD REFLECT an Order of Assignment is initiated electronically by the above-named deputy clerk.

Obligations of child support terminate when each child attains the age of 18 years or is otherwise emancipated, but in the event any child attains the age of 18 years while attending high school, support shall continue to be provided during the period in which the child is actually attending high school but only until the child reaches 19 years of age. **If the parties have more than one child, the amount of child support owed is not automatically reduced by the child's share as each child is emancipated; rather the parties must request a modification of the child support order in writing and pursuant to the Rules of Family Law Procedure.** Provision for health insurance and non-insured health expenses for the children, as provided below, shall be deemed to be additional child support and shall be enforceable as such.

Pursuant to A.R.S. § 25-503(I), the right to receive child support payments as provided herein vests as each installment falls due. Each vested child support installment is enforceable as a final judgment by operation of law.

VI. MEDICAL INSURANCE.

IT IS ORDERED that Father shall maintain medical insurance for the minor children. Father shall ensure that Mother is kept informed at all times of the name and address of the

¹ Although Father would be entitled for past support, commencing December 1, 2011, the Court found that a strict application of the child support guidelines in this case is inappropriate or unjust and that the Court has considered the best interests of the children in determining that a deviation of \$364.43 per month for the period from December 1, 2011 through April 30, 2012 from the amount determined under the guidelines is appropriate to reduce Mother's child support during the period from December 1, 2011 through April 30, 2012. In the Joint Pre-trial Statement, Father asserted that he provided insurance for the minor children; however, Father failed to testify regarding the cost of the insurance.

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

FC 2011-007061

04/30/2012

insurance provider as well as the policy number. Additionally, Father shall provide Mother with valid insurance cards and policy information and updated information.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that any non-covered or uninsured medical, dental, orthodontic, optical, prescription expenses, deductibles, and co-pays shall be paid 50% by Father and 50% by Mother. If one party pays a health-related expense, any request for reimbursement of the other party's share shall be made within 180 days after the date the health-related services are rendered. If a party seeks reimbursement, the party from whom reimbursement is sought may request receipts or other evidence of payment. The party seeking reimbursement shall promptly provide the requested receipts and/or evidence of payment. The party from whom reimbursement is sought shall pay the requested reimbursement, or make acceptable payment arrangements, within 45 days of receiving receipts or evidence of payment. Both parties shall use their best efforts to obtain services that are covered by the insurance.

VII. DEPENDENCY EXEMPTION.

Pursuant to Rule 27 of the Arizona Child Support Guidelines, allocation of the dependency exemption between the parties essentially proportionate to income is appropriate. Based thereon,

IT IS ORDERED that Mother may claim the dependency exemption for Alexa in every year. Father may claim the dependency exemption for Ashley in all tax years. If the party entitled to the exemption does not realize a financial benefit from the exemption for a given tax year, the other party shall be entitled to claim the tax exemption for that tax year.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that each party shall execute any forms required in order to implement these terms.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Mother's right to claim the exemption in any given year is conditioned upon payment by Mother by December 31st of the total Court-ordered monthly child support obligation for that calendar year and any Court-ordered arrearage payments due during the calendar year for which the exemption is to be claimed.

VIII. EXCHANGE OF INCOME INFORMATION.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the parties shall exchange income information every twenty-four (24) months from the date of the entry of this Judgment for so long as a child support obligation is in place. The financial information shall included, but is not limited to: personal tax returns with all schedules, affidavits of financial information, earning statements and other such documentation necessary to establish or prove the income of either party. In

SUPERIOR COURT OF ARIZONA
MARICOPA COUNTY

FC 2011-007061

04/30/2012

addition, at the time of the exchange of financial information, the parties shall also exchange residential addresses and the names and addresses of their respective employers.

IX. ATTORNEY'S FEES.

The Court has considered the parties' respective financial resources and the reasonableness of their positions pursuant to A.R.S. § 25-324.

IT IS ORDERED that each party bear his/her own attorneys' fees, costs and expenses.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED signing this minute entry as a formal order of this Court pursuant to Rule 81, Arizona Rules of Family Law Procedure.

/s/ Honorable Pamela Gates

Honorable Pamela S. Gates

Judge of the Superior Court

Exhibit Worksheet and Child Support Worksheet to be filed

All parties representing themselves must keep the Court updated with address changes. A form may be downloaded at: <http://www.superiorcourt.maricopa.gov/SuperiorCourt/Self-ServiceCenter>.